



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,199	11/12/2003	David J.P. Baar	198821-388249	2923
75671 7590 05/12/2009 Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, ps 422 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 424 Spokane, WA 99201				
EXAMINER DEBNATH, SUMAN				
ART UNIT 2435		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 05/12/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,199

Applicant(s)

BAAR, DAVID J.P.

Examiner

SUMAN DEBNATH

Art Unit

2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/16/2009

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 and 10-35 are pending in this application.
2. Claim 9 is canceled.
3. Claims 1-8, 10-20 are currently amended.
4. Claims 21-35 are newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-17, 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullet et al. (Patent Number: 5,638,523) (hereinafter, "Mullet") and further in view of Pebley et al. (Patent No.: US 6,154,840).

7. As to claim 1, A method for controlling access to secured information in a predetermined region of an image, comprising:

Mullet discloses distorting a predetermined region to present an information with context from an image (FIG. 3a, col. 5, lines 63-67, "magnifying"; col. 5, lines 58-67, Mullet teaches of distorting a predetermined region by choosing an area to view in detail within the image map, i.e. FIG. 3a, item 13).

Mullet doesn't disclose the authorization aspect of the invention. However, Pebley discloses determining whether access is authorized to a secured information (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62); and, in response to said determining, provide with said secured information when determining indicates that access is authorized (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mullet as taught by Pebley in order to permit only the legitimate client to access any secure information.

8. As to claims 20 and 23, these are rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

9. As to claim 2, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose comprising uncovering said predetermined region when said determining indicates that access is authorized (Pebley: col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

10. As to claim 7, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said determining is performed in response to receipt of a signal that selects said predetermined region (Mullet: col. 4, lines 41-43).

11. As to claim 8, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said signal comprises a cursor movement (Mullet: col. 4, lines 41-43).

12. As to claim 28, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said predetermined region is presented at a same level of detail as said context when authorization is denied (Mullet: col. 4, lines 41-43).

13. As to claim 22, it is rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 28.

14. As to claim 10, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said distorting results in presentation of said secured information in detail in comparison to said context from said image (Pebley: col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

15. As to claim 11, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said distorting comprises magnifying said predetermined region in comparison to said image (Mullet: col. 5, lines 63-67).

16. As to claim 12, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said secured information is encrypted information (Pebley: col. 2, lines 50-62).

17. As to claim 24, it is rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 12.

18. As to claim 13, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said distorting further comprises decrypting said encrypted information (Pebley: col. 2, lines 50-62).

19. As to claim 14, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said image includes at least one of a graphic image, a photographic image, and a text image (Pebley: col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

20. As to claim 26, it is rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 14.

21. As to claim 15, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said distorting comprises: applying a distortion function to said image to distort said predetermined region by displacing said original image onto said distortion function and projecting said image with said predetermined region distorted onto a plane. (Mullet: FIG. 2a, column 4, lines 20-24, column 5, lines 8-17, FIG. 3a).

22. As to claim 35, it is rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 15.

23. As to claim 16, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said applying further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over said distorted

region for receiving one or more signals for adjusting said distortion function. (Mullet: col. 1, lines 65-67, FIG. 3a, FIG. 7).

24. As to claims 21 and 34, these are rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 16.

25. As to claims 29 and 33, these are rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

26. As to claim 31, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said reminder of the image comprises a portion of said image that is not said predetermined region (Mullet: FIG. 2a, column 4, lines 20-24, column 5, lines 8-17, FIG. 3a).

27. As to claim 32, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said module to generate the presentation is further configured to present a graphical user interface that prevents observation of said predetermined region when access is denied (Pebley: col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

28. As to claim 17, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said applying results in presentation of a focal region having a magnification for said predetermined region at least partially surrounded by a shoulder region where said magnification decreases to that of said image to provide context for said predetermined

region with respect to said original image, and said GUI is for adjusting at least one of: said magnification; a concavity of said shoulder region; an extent for said focal region; an extent for said shoulder region; a location for said distortion function within said original image; a location for an outline of said shoulder region within said image; and, a location for said focal region relative to said shoulder region to define a degree and a direction of a folding of said distortion function (Mullet: FIG. 2a, column 4, lines 20-24, column 5, lines 8-17, FIG. 3a).

29. As to claim 25 and 30, these are rejected using the similar rationale as for the rejection of claim 17.

30. As to claim 27, the combinations of Mullet and Pebley disclose wherein said distorting comprises manipulating said image (Mullet: FIG. 2a, column 4, lines 20-24, column 5, lines 8-17, FIG. 3a).

31. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullet and further in view of Pebley and Brew et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196114 A1), (hereinafter "Brew").

32. As to claim 3, neither Mullet nor Pebley explicitly disclose wherein said determining comprises receiving authentication information and comparing said authentication information to stored authentication information to indicate whether

access is authorized. However, Brew discloses wherein said determining comprises receiving authentication information and comparing said authentication information to stored authentication information to indicate whether access is authorized (Brew: FIG. 10, [0085], lines 5-7 and lines 11-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mullet and Pebley as taught by Brew in order to "control access to protected content (Brew, [0009])."

33. As to claim 4, the combinations of Mullet, Pebley and Brew disclose wherein said authentication information includes at least one of a user identification or a password (Brew: [0085], lines 11-12).

34. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullet and further in view of Pebley and Foley et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0087894 A1) (hereinafter, "Foley").

35. As to claim 18, neither Mullet nor Pebley explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information is biometric information. However, Foley discloses wherein said determining further comprises: receiving biometric information; and comparing said biometric information to stored biometric information ([0026], lines 21-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mullet and Pebley as taught by Foley in order to

provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

36. As to claim 19, the combinations of Mullet, Pebley and Foley disclose wherein said biometric information includes fingerprint, iris pattern, voice pattern, and DNA pattern information (Foley: [0026], lines 21-27).

37. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullet and further in views of Pebley, Brew and Foley.

38. As to claim 5, neither Mullet nor Pebley and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information is received through a dialog box. However, Foley discloses wherein said authentication information is received through a dialog box ([0026], lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mullet, Pebley and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

39. As to claim 6, neither Mullet nor Pebley and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said dialog box is presented adjacent to said predetermined region. However, Foley discloses wherein said dialog box is presented adjacent to said predetermined region ([0026], lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mullet, Pebley and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

40. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

41. Applicant has amended claims 1-8, 10-20, which necessitated new rejection, see rejection above.

Conclusion

42. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAN DEBNATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2435
/Kimyen Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435